



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*'Emperor'-Worship in Babylonia.*¹—By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER,
Professor in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago.

This subject has never been systematically discussed. Most writers on ancient religions repeat the assertion that the practice was common in ancient Babylonia, but unknown in Assyria. Their assertion is based upon conclusions arrived at chiefly by Sayce, Radau, Scheil, and Thureau-Dangin.² As none of these Assyriologists, however, has pretended to treat the subject with any degree of completeness, the object of this paper will be to examine the sources and attempt an estimate, so far as our present knowledge will permit.

The subject under consideration is a difficult one to estimate, chiefly because the translation of ancient terms into what are considered modern equivalents often leaves the impression that the ancient term had the same connotation as the modern one, and we are apt to read ideas into the former which are peculiar to the latter. It will be well, therefore, to begin by defining our terms. It will also be well to keep in mind, during the discussion, the fact that we are compelled to use modern phraseology to express ancient ideas.

¹ Abbreviations of less common use employed in this article are: AB = *Assyriologische Bibliothek*, Leipzig, 1881 ff.; AO = *Antiquités Orientales*, Louvre; BE = *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, Series A and D, Philadelphia, 1893 ff.; Bu = Budge (British Museum); EAH = E. A. Hoffman Collection in EBH; EBH = Radau, *Early Babylonian History*, New York, 1900; OBI = Hilprecht, *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, Philadelphia, 1893; RA = *Revue d'Assyriologie*, Paris, 1884 ff.; RT = *Récueil de Travaux*, Paris, 1870 ff.; RTC = Thureau-Dangin, *Récueil de tablettes chaldéennes*, Paris, 1903; RTllh = Reisner, *Tempelurkunden aus Telloh*, Berlin, 1901; SAK = Thureau-Dangin, *Die Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königsinschriften*, Leipzig, 1907; TSA = Genouillac, *Tablettes sumériennes archaïques*, Paris, 1909; UPBS = *University of Pennsylvania, Babylonian Section*, Philadelphia, 1911 ff.

² The chief discussions of the subject are to be found in: Radau, *Early Babylonian History*, New York, 1900; Scheil, RT. 18. 64-74, *Le culte de Gudea sous la IIe dynastie d'Ur*; Thureau-Dangin, RT. 19. 185-187, *Le culte des Rois dans la période prébabylonienne*; Huber, *Die Personennamen* (AB. 21), Leipzig, 1907; Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sternendienst in Babel*, Münster, 1909; Janneau, *Une dynastie chaldéenne des Rois d'Ur*, Paris, 1911; Legrain, *Les Temps des Rois d'Ur*, Paris, 1912.

Among modern Western peoples it is usual to define 'worship' as the act of paying divine honor, reverence, and adoration to the one Supreme Being. But ancient peoples paid divine honor, reverence, and adoration to one or more gods. We think of 'god' as a being who, though personal, is not limited by time or space as we are. But primitive peoples think of 'god' as a being different from themselves only in size and power. He is endowed with body, parts, and passions, and lives and acts just like any man. The worship which a primitive man pays to his god is practically that of a modern monotheist, the difference consisting in the worshiper's idea of the god and of his character.

The ancient Babylonians, as well as most primitive peoples, considered the relationship between the gods and man to be very close indeed. His idea of god did not necessitate an impassable gulf between the two. The gods were very near to him; and he was certain that not only was the first man the son of god, but also that his own chief or king, so much more powerful than himself, was related to the god, and had been nurtured by the gods. The difference between the king and the gods was very small indeed. Yet there was a real difference—the king was visible at any time, but the gods could be seen only occasionally, and even then only by the elect. Moreover, the king was subject to death, but the gods were not. There was, then, in the mind of the ancient Babylonians an undoubted difference between them.

It can easily be conceived that the ancient Babylonian honored his god with extravagant love and extreme submission, that he adored him and 'idolized' him, just as any modern may adore and honor a king, hero, or lover with an equal extravagance of love and submission. But just as the modern would not identify the object of his love with the Supreme Being, so it must be concluded that primitive man would be conscious at least of a certain amount of difference between the mortal king and the immortal god.

The ancient Babylonian believed that each man had a spirit which would outlive the body. He believed that the spirit was still more closely related to the gods. In fact, the lack of tangible acquaintance with the spirit and its capacities paved the way for the tendency which would easily develop into divine reverence. At any rate, it would be less difficult for us to believe that the Babylonians really worshiped certain of their dead,

especially their dead heroes and kings, than it is to believe that they paid really divine honors to the living king. It will be necessary, therefore, in the present study to keep clearly in mind the two sides of our problem, namely the question of the worship of the dead king and that of the living king.

Professor Sayce of Oxford was the first to assert that the early Babylonian kings were deified.³ In his article, *The Babylonian Cyinders found by General di Cesnola in the Treasury of the Temple at Kurium* in Cyprus, it is clear that a certain Abil-Ištar is called the 'servant of *ilu*Naram-*ilu*Sin.' Now the word *ilu* before Sin is translated 'god,' and it is almost always used with the name of a deity, as in the case of Sin. But the *ilu* before Naram, since Naram is not known to be the name of a deity, was considered by Sayce, and has generally been thought since, to show that the well-known king Naram-Sin was deified. Since then, whenever a proper name has been found containing an element, not the name of a deity, preceded by *ilu*, it has been taken as an indication of deification. The same is true of the Sumerian word *dingir*, 'god.'

In our discussion of names with *dingir*, or *ilu*, we shall take no notice of the names of mythological kings and heroes, such as *dingir Ga-tum-dug*;⁴ nor of the Babylonian Noah, *Tagtug*(?), which name has the divine determinative, *dingir*;⁵ nor of the hero's name in the Assyrian fragments of the Etana epic, which is also preceded by the divine determinative.⁶

The use of *dingir* or *ilu* in the names of living men, which contain a divine name, is very common. In fact, whenever a divine name is found, with very few exceptions, e. g. *Anu-um-pi-ilu-šamaš*,⁷ the divine determinative is used. From the earliest to the latest times, and in inscriptions representing all classes of literature, names of persons are found compounded with a divine name preceded by the divine determinative. This is a rule which has very few—although some—exceptions. The

³ TSBA. 5 (1877), p. 441 ff.

⁴ Paffrath, *Zur Götterlehre in den altbabylonischen Königsinschriften*, Paderborn, 1913, p. 130 ff.

⁵ Langdon, *An Account of the Pre-Semitic Version of the Fall of Man*, PBSA. 36. 258.

⁶ Poebel, *Historical Texts*, UPBS. 4. 1, p. 113.

⁷ Ungnad, *Babyl. Briefe aus der Zeit der Hammurabi Dynastie*, Leipzig, 1914, p. 409. This is in contradiction to Pinches in PSBA. 1915, p. 87.

old king *Ur d.Ninâ*,⁸ the Cassite ruler *d.Ka-daš-man-d.Bel*,⁹ the Assyrian king *iluSin-aḥê-irba*,¹⁰ and the late Babylonian king *iluNabunaid*¹¹ are a few examples of royal names which contain the divine determinative *ilu* or *dingir* because of the presence of a divine name, such, e. g., as Ninâ, Ka, Bel, Sin, and Nabu.

Nor is the practice confined to royal names. There are numerous names of men in various walks of life which contain the divine determinative because of the presence of a divine name. Such, for example, is the name of the scribe *Gal-d.Nin-saḥ*,¹² or the name of a man which begins with a divine name, e. g., *d.Marduk-na-si-ir*.¹³ The use is extended to any name containing the name of a deity. A canal is called *a-d-nin-tu(id)*,¹⁴ a door is called *bâb-ilu-si-it-iluŠamšîšî*,¹⁵ a wall is called *im-gur-iluellil*,¹⁶ a place is called *mātu-iluAššur*¹⁷.

From this it would appear that the word for 'god' used by the Sumerians and Babylonians, who were really polytheists, was almost always prefixed to the individual or proper name of the deity, no matter where that name appeared. It is partly illustrated by the use which we make of the word 'Saint.' We speak of William St. George Tucker, or Cape St. John, or St. Mary's Bay, the 'Saint' remaining as part of the personal or place name.

In the instances so far discussed, there can, however, be no proof of deification. The personal or place name has the divine determinative solely because of the presence of a divine name, and not at all because the person or place is deified.

The case of the use of *dingir* or *ilu* in personal names, which are, let it be noted, always royal names, and are not thought to contain a divine name, is rather different. Such names must now be examined.

⁸ SAK. 3, a.

⁹ BE. A. 14. 46.

¹⁰ Scheil, *Le Prisme S d'Assarhaddon*, Paris, 1914, p. 10.

¹¹ KB. 3. 2, p. 96.

¹² Barton, *Haverford Library Collection of Cuneiform Tablets*, Philadelphia, 1909, 2. 9.

¹³ Pinches, *Berens Collection*, London, 1915, p. 119.

¹⁴ Streck, *Assurbanipal*, Leipzig, 1916, p. 242.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 825.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 826.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 773.

Janneau¹⁸ thinks that long before the time of Sargon I¹⁹ and Naram-Sin there is to be found a royal name, which has the divine determinative and which does not contain the name of a deity. He refers to the uncertain name *d-Dun-ušbar*(?) found in an inscription published by Hilprecht in his OBI. 48. Hilprecht dates the inscription in the reign of Entemena. The brevity of the inscription leaves the exact identity of the king uncertain. But there is no question that the reason for the use of *dingir* is because *Dun* is a divine name, equivalent to *Bau*.²⁰ The same is true of the use of the divine determinative with the name of the patesi Urukagina, as it occurs on some seals discussed by de la Fuye²¹—the word *Uru* is a divine name.

The first royal name which appears to have the divine determinative without the presence of the name of a deity is Sargon of the dynasty of Akkad. In OBI. 2. 1 it reads *d.Šar-ga-lí-šàr-rí*. Inscription *h* of SAK. 164 shows that the title *ilu* was prefixed to the name during his lifetime. Now, if it were certain that *Šar* is not the name of a deity, we should have a genuine example of a royal name with the divine title. Of this, however, we are not certain. Our knowledge of early Babylonian deities has its limitations; and from the positive standpoint we know that *d.Šar-gaz* is a divine name.²² Moreover *d.Šar* (Deimel, *op. cit.* 3083) is equivalent to *An-šar*, which is a variant for *ilu Ašur*. If the element *šar* of this and similar names ever stood alone as the name of a deity, there would be no question of the reason for the *dingir* with Sargon, but *šar* has never been so found, and the question must be left somewhat in doubt, though it seems most likely that the *dingir* is used with *šar* because it is equivalent to *An-šar*, a variant of *ilu Ašur*.

The case of Naram-Sin of the same dynasty is similar. For the *dingir* with *Naram*²³ may be due to the divine element *na* = *an-na* = *ilu Anum*, just as we find *dingir* with the element *En* in the royal name *Ur-d.Engur*, the *dingir* being due not to *Engur*,

¹⁸ Janneau, *Une dynastie Chaldéenne des Rois d'Ur*, Paris, 1911.

¹⁹ I shall use this form of the name rather than the more correct *Šar-gani-šarri* or *Šar-ga-lí-šàr-rí*.

²⁰ Br. 9867/73.

²¹ RA. 6. 107, *Les sceaux de Lougalanda*.

²² Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum*, Rome, 1914, 3084.

²³ The name occurs as *d.Na-ra-am-d.Sin*.

which is not known to be a divine name, but to the divine element *En*.

The royal name Naram-sin is almost always found with the divine determinative not only in the reign of the king himself, but in later times. The phrase '*d*.Naram-Sin in the seventh year wast thou named,'²⁴ has nothing to do with the question of the time when the king may have been deified.

All the kings of the third dynasty of Ur, except Ur-*d*.Engur, the first king, prefixed the divine determinative to their names. Dungi, the second king, was the first to assume the divine title.²⁵ The same question arises here as above, namely, is not the *dingir*, with Dungi, due to the divine name *Dun* (= *Bau*)? Such was Winckler's opinion.²⁶ At any rate, no theory of the deification of Dungi, during his lifetime, can be built upon an uncertainty such as this.

The name of Bur-Sin²⁷ is almost always found preceded by the divine determinative, but this element *Bur* (= *Amar*)²⁸ may evidently be a divine name.

Nothing of more definiteness can be said, on the basis of the use of *dingir*, about the other kings of the third dynasty of Ur, during their lifetime, namely, of *d*.Gimil-*d*.Sin (or perhaps better, *d*.Šu-*d*.Sin), and *d*.I-bi-*d*.Sin. In fact, *d*.Šu = Marduk,²⁹ and *d*.I occurs in personal names as the name of a deity.³⁰

All the extant names of the kings of the Isin dynasty,^{30a} except one, have the prefixed *dingir*. In the case of the names *d*.En-lil-ba-ni and *d*.Sin-ma-gir there is no doubt that the *dingir* occurs because of the divine names Enlil and Sin. It is likely that the *dingir* in the names *d*.Ur-*d*.Nin-IB, *d*.Bur-*d*.Sin, *d*.Ir-ra (*Nergal*)-i-mi-ti, and *d*.Za-an-bi-a is due to the presence of a divine name, e. g., Ur, Bur, Irra, and Za. It is possible that the *dingir* in the remaining names, namely, *d*.Iš-bi-ir-ra, *d*.I-din-*d*.Da-

²⁴ Langdon, BE. 31, no. 1, in a hymn to Ninlil (Dungi?).

²⁵ CT. 7. 47:17775; RTlh. 173; Genouillac, *Inventaire des Tablettes de Tello*, Paris, 1911, 2. 970, 3508.

²⁶ KB. 3. 1, 80, n. 3.

²⁷ Otherwise Pûr-Sin or Amar-Sin.

²⁸ Deimel, *op. cit.* 384-386 and 392.

²⁹ Br. 10535, 10661.

³⁰ Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names*, Philadelphia, 1905, p. 199.

^{30a} See Poebel, *op. cit.* p. 94.

gan, ^dIš-me-^dDa-gan, ^dLi-bi-it-ištar, ^dI-te-ir-pî-ša, and ^dDa-mi-ik-î-lî-šu, can be explained in the same way.

The name ^dI-bi-ik-^dAdad occurs with³¹ and without³² the divine determinative before *Ibik*. The name is not otherwise identified, but the same remark applies to this name as to the element *Ibi* in *Ibi-Sin* of the dynasty of Ur.

The name of the famous king Hammurabi is also found with the divine determinative, e. g., ^{ilu}Ha-am-mu-ra-bi.³³ *Hammu* may be the name of a god, though it has never so far been found as such; or the *Ha* may be a divine element, like *En* in *Engur*.³⁴

Of the dynasty of Larsa we find the following royal names with the divine determinative: ^dNu-ùr-^{ilu}Adad (or *Immer*), ^dSin-i-din-nam, ^dSin-i-ki-ša-am, ^dWarad-^dSin, and ^dRi-im-^dSin. *Nu-ùr* is probably a divine name;³⁵ *Sin* is a divine name; but neither *Warad* (*Arad*) nor *Rim* occurs as the name of a deity, although ^dRI = *Ištar*.³⁶

Hilprecht³⁷ finds six Cassite kings with names preceded by *ilu*, namely, Kurigalzu, Nazi-Maruttaš, Kadašman-Turgu, Kadašman-Bel (Enlil), Kudur-Bel, Šagarakti-Šuriaš. We know so little about the Cassite god-names that it is precarious to attempt any decision as to the nature of the use of *ilu* here.

Huber holds that female rulers were deified, e. g., ^dNin-^da-ú,³⁸ but the divine element *Nin* would sufficiently account for the use of the divine determinative.

The use of the divine determinative, in the lifetime of these early kings, can be accounted for, very often, by the presence of a divine name, or a divine element as the royal name; and where the element having the divine determinative has not been identified as the name of a deity there is no certainty that it is not such.

Almost all the royal names containing the divine determinative, which we have reviewed, were often used after the death of their bearers, with the divine determinative, sometimes alone,

³¹ *Rev. Sém.* 1911, p. 338-9 (*Ibiq-Adad, prince divinisé*).

³² *Catal. des Cyl. de la Bib. Nationale*, no. 198.

³³ Strassm., *Warka*, 28, ll. 16, 36 (BM. 33212).

³⁴ See Deimel, *op. cit.* 1377-1396.

³⁵ *Op. cit.* 2336.

³⁶ Br. 2561.

³⁷ BE. A. 20. 52; cf. 14. 46.

³⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 38.

and often in combination with another element to form a proper name. The occurrence of the divine determinative with the former can be explained as above, but the latter use is different, and very interesting. For example, *Dungi* is found in the name *^dDungi-ili*, 'Dungi is my god.' Such a name may indicate nothing more than that its first user wished to honor the king by employing such an expression as a proper name, just as in the case of the Hebrew name, אֱלֹהֵי מֶלֶךְ, 'my god is king,' or 'the king is my god.' In like manner Samuel was referred to as אֱלֹהִים after his death. An especially interesting name, in this connection, is *^dDungi-uru*, 'Dungi is Uru (a god).' Here it is quite possible that the person who first used the name *^dDungi-uru* believed that the old king Dungi was the same as the god Uru, although he may only have intended to honor the memory of Dungi by the identification. A similar explanation may be offered for the name *^dDungi-ba-ni*, 'Dungi is my creator.' It must be remembered that we do not know exactly how such compound names came to be used, nor do we know how much or how little significance was attached to their meaning. The number of royal names which seems to take the place of divine names is very large.³⁹ It is, however, certain that the use of a royal name, together with a divine element, in a personal name is no proof that the king mentioned was deified during his lifetime. For example, in an unpublished tablet from Tello, preserved in the Museum at Constantinople,⁴⁰ there occurs the proper name *Ili-Urumuš* (or *Rimuš*). Now Urumuš, as the name of a king of the dynasty of Akkad previous to Sargon I, is never found with the divine determinative. *Ili-Urumuš*, 'my god is Urumuš,' found after the lifetime of Urumuš, is best explained as in the case of *^dDungi-ili*.

In one of the cylinders found at Kurium, referred to above, *Abū-Ištar* is called the 'servant of *^{ilu}Naram-^{ilu}Sin*.' It is not, however, certain that the cylinder does not belong to the reign of Naram-Sin himself.

No inscription of the lifetime of Gudea contains his name with the prefixed divine determinative.⁴¹ But as early as the reign of Dungi, Gudea's name is frequently found with the

³⁹ Huber, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁴⁰ Janneau, *op. cit.* p. 34, fig. x, etc.

⁴¹ The *dingir* in SAK. Statue, C, 1, 2, refers not to Gudea but to *Nin-giš-zida*.

divine determinative,⁴² and there are personal names found, such as *Gin^d.Gudea*, *Lu^{ilu}.Gudea*. It must not be forgotten, however, that there is a god by the name *d^d.Gu*,⁴³ which may be an explanation of the use of the *dingir* with Gudea.

We have now examined every royal name not usually thought to contain the name of a deity prefixed by the divine determinative during the lifetime of the king. We have also noted that these same royal names were often used with the divine determinative after the death of the king, and in one case, namely, Gudea, we found that the divine determinative was used, but never till after his death. What did the divine determinative mean? Are we to take it in its literal sense as 'god' or are we to consider it honorific, like our word 'lord'? Was it ever used as we do the word 'divine' or as Isaiah did the word אֱלֹהִים⁴⁴

Hehn has shown⁴⁵ that the Hebrew word for 'god,' אֱלֹהִים, is often equivalent to מֶלֶךְ, 'king,' or to בַּעַל, 'lord.' The same, it seems, can be said for *ilu* or *dingir*. Hammurabi in his code, 3. 16, calls himself *ilu šarri*, 'god of the kings.' This evidently is to be taken as 'king of the kings,' and is equivalent to 3. 70, *etel šarri*, 'lord of the kings,' or 4. 23, *ašarid šarri*, 'prince of the kings.' Have we not a parallel in Ex. 4. 16, Ps. 45. 7, Is. 9. 6? In India the Brahmans and kings are regularly called *deva*. The expression *ma-har-i-lim* which occurs so often in the Code of Hammurabi, e. g., 7. 36; 9. 35, etc., is literally translated 'before the god,' but freely 'before the judge,' as in Ex. 21. 6; 22. 8 ff.; cf. Ps. 82. 1 f., 58. 2. The honorific title 'god' is applied to judges both in Israel and Babylonia, and likewise to kings. Hence the name *Hammurabi-ilu* does not necessarily mean in the literal sense 'Hammurabi is god,' but is an honorific title equivalent to 'Hammurabi is king' or 'king of kings.' Of course, no title would be considered too great for a humble and grateful subject to confer upon his king; so we have such names as *Hammurabi-Šamši*, 'Hammurabi is Šamaš,' *Hammurabi-bani*, 'Hammurabi is my creator.' Further, in the *Gilg. Epos*, Col. 2, IIIb, 30f. (KB. 6. 1. 138) *ilûtu*, 'godhead,'

⁴² Janneau, *op. cit.* p. 34, fig. x, etc.

⁴³ Deimel, *op. cit.* 540.

⁴⁴ Is. 9. 6.

⁴⁵ *Biblische u. Babyl. Gottesidee*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 205 ff.

is parallel to *šarrûtu*, 'kingship,' and in Bu. 88-5-12, 75 and 76, 21 we have *Kussû ilûti*, 'throne of deity,' which seems to mean 'throne of royalty.' Moreover, we have very definite evidence that *dingir* does not always refer to a deity, for in Gudea, Cyl. A, 6. 21 we read *dingir kar-á*, 'divine sword.' It seems, therefore, that the words *dingir* and *ilu* are not always to be taken in their literal meaning of 'god,' in reference to a real superhuman divine being. Accordingly in the Obelisk of Maništusu the phrase *šarru-ili*, 'the king is god,' is most likely honorific, as is the title *Šarru-Gi-ili*, 'Šarru-Gi is my god.'⁴⁶

Such expressions as ^{ilu}*Na-ra-am-ilu Sin ilu A-ga-de^{ki}*, 'Naram-Sin, the god of Akkad,'⁴⁷ have been taken as conclusive proof of the deification of Naram-Sin. The title, however, may be merely honorific. Moreover, Heuzey⁴⁸ considered the phrase ^{ilu}*A-ga-de^{ki}* a deification of the city, but Thureau-Dangin is probably right in thinking it the title of the king; although there is no genitive sign after *A-ga-de^{ki}*, which, however, is not always represented in such sentences.

Dungi calls himself *dingir kalam-ma-na*, 'god of his country.'⁴⁹ The phrase does not necessarily mean more than 'king of his country.' Bur-Sin styles himself *dingir-zi(d) Kalam-ma-na*⁵⁰ 'the righteous god of his country,' and *dingir-zi(d) dingir bab-bar kalam-ma-na*, 'the righteous god, the sun of his country.'⁵¹ The phrase *a-šag d-Bur-d-Sin dungir-ni ki-ag*, 'the field of Bur-Sin, his beloved god,'⁵² has the same title applied to the king; and the same remark may be applied here and to the two previous examples as above. Similarly, Gimil-Sin is called 'his god' by *Lugal-má-gúr-ri*;⁵³ and Ibi-Sin is called *dingir Kalam-ma-na*,⁵⁴ 'god of his country.' These also may be considered honorific titles.

⁴⁶ See also above.

⁴⁷ RA. 4. no. iii, pl. vii, nos. 22, 23, and perhaps 26; RT. 19. 187; SAK. 168, k; RTC. nos. 165, 166.

⁴⁸ RA. 4. 10-12, *Sceaux inédits des rois d'Agadé*.

⁴⁹ Janneau, *op. cit.* fig. xiii.

⁵⁰ SAK. 201, i.

⁵¹ SAK. 198, e.

⁵² CT. 94-10-16, 4, rev. iii.

⁵³ SAK. 202, c.

⁵⁴ RA. 7, no. 1, p. 49.

The expression *E-d.Dungi*, 'temple of Dungi,'⁵⁵ which occurs many times, has been taken to indicate the existence of a cult of Dungi. But of the many temples erected by him⁵⁶ there is no indication that any one was erected as a place for the worship of himself as god. Moreover, the fact that Dungi erected a temple for his father, *Ur-d.Engur*,⁵⁷ whose name never begins with the divine determinative, would seem to show that the temple was not necessarily erected for the worship of *Ur-d.Engur*, but only to his memory or in his name, for the worship of a god.

Lugal-má-gúr-ri, an officer of king Gimil-Sin, erected a temple for the king.⁵⁸ But there is nothing here to show that the temple was built to Gimil-Sin. The text reads: *d.gimil-ilu Sin ki-ág d.en-lil-lá lugal d.en-lil-li ki-ág ša(g)-ga-na in-pa(d) lugal kal-ga lugal urí-ki-ma lugal an-ub-da tab-tab-ba d.ra-ni-ir lugal-má-gúr-ri nu-ban(da) en-nu-gà pa-te-si urí-ki-ma arad-da-ni é-ki-ág-gà-ni mu-na-an-dū*, 'for Gimil-Sin beloved of Enlil, the king, whom Enlil has chosen as his beloved, the mighty king, king of Ur, king of the four quarters of the world, his god, Lugal-má-gúr-ri, captain of the fortress, patesi of Ur, his servant, built his beloved temple.' In fact there is an inscription⁵⁹ which would seem to indicate that all such temples were built for the worship of current gods and not for deified kings; but were in honor of, or as memorials of, the kings or other important personages. The inscription alluded to shows that Eannatum, son of king Išme-Dagan, of the dynasty of Isin, and priests of Ur, dedicated a temple to the sun-god: 'for the life of Gungunu, king of Ur.' Eannatum calls himself 'son of *d.Išme-ilu* Dagan,' but he does not add the divine determinative to Gungunu, who, in fact, *never claims the title*, but who calls himself king of Larsa and of Sumer and Akkad. The temple is obviously in honor of Gungunu and was built in order to gain the sun-god's favor for the king. In any case, there is nothing to show that it was for the purpose of worshiping Gungunu. The cult of a Babylonian king is never mentioned. The passage which has been taken to refer

⁵⁵ RTlh. 119, XI, 15; cf. RTC. 417 and 418; SAK. 231, notes i and n.

⁵⁶ SAK. 190-197.

⁵⁷ CT. 7. 47:17775; RTlh. 173; *Inv. d. tab. d. Tello*, 2. 970, 3508.

⁵⁸ SAK. 200, c.

⁵⁹ SAK. 206, b.

to the cult of Dungi reads: *mu en-nam-x dingir dun-gi-ra-ge ba-gub ba-šú*, ‘year in which the chief priest of Dungi was invested and appointed.’⁶⁰ There is no reference to a cult here, but to the king’s high priest.

As early as the time of Lugal-anda of Lagaš, we find that there was erected a statue of Ur-Ninâ, a former king of Lagaš, in connection with which offerings were made.⁶¹ But Ur-Ninâ never laid claim to deity. The same is true of Šagšag, wife of Urukagina, who made offerings in connection with her own statue,⁶² as well as of other early rulers.⁶³ Gudea, patesi of Lagaš, set up a statue of himself in the temple of Ningirsu, and ordered offerings to be made in connection with it.⁶⁴ Bur-Sin erected his statue (*šalam-ba*) and built a temple for it.⁶⁵ The context does not make it clear whether the statue was of himself or not. In connection also with a statue of Gimil-Sin offerings were made.⁶⁶

While most of these statues seem to have represented the king or patesi, there is no proof that sacrifices were offered to them; and even if the proof were forthcoming it would not demonstrate that the represented king was considered a god, as such an example as that found in Dan. 2. 46-47 would prove. In fact, King,⁶⁷ who believes in the deification of Babylonian kings, says that the statues of Gudea were merely votive in character, and not a sign that he made any claim to divinity. He further says that such a statue was intended to represent the worshiper vicariously before his god, and the offerings were placed near the statue to represent symbolically the owner’s offerings to his god.⁶⁸

In the reign of Urukagina, king of Lagaš, offerings were made before the statue of his queen Šagšag while she was still living.⁶⁹ This certainly seems to represent symbolically the queen’s offer-

⁶⁰ SAK. 235, h.

⁶¹ RA. 6. 107; Genouillac, TSA. p. lvii.

⁶² King, *A History of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 273.

⁶³ Genouillac, TSA. p. lvii, and note 1.

⁶⁴ SAK. Gudea B, col. i. 3-11; cf. RT. 18. 64 ff.; RA. 3. 135 ff.

⁶⁵ CT. 21. 25-26.

⁶⁶ RT. 19. 185 ff.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.* p. 272.

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 273.

⁶⁹ Genouillac, TSA. no. 34, vi, and Rev. vi; no. 35, v, and Rev. iv.

ing to her god. There is no indication that Šagšag was ever deified. We have reason to believe that offerings were made before the statue of Gudea;⁷⁰ and Scheil in RT. 1896, p. 70-71, in his article *Le culte de Gudea*, quotes an offering in connection with Gudea; but the inscriptions do not make it clear whether it is *for* or *to* Gudea. The fact that Gudea has the divine determinative is no proof that we have an offering to him as to a god.

An interesting account is found in CT. 7, pl. 47⁷¹ of 'one (servant) (for?) the mortuary sacrifice (*ki-a-nag*) of *d.Dungi*.' Parallel to the phrase in the same account is 'one (for?) the mortuary sacrifice of *Ma-d-Engur*,' who does not seem to be a deity, and this would show that the offering was made to Dungi not as to a god, but most likely was made *for* or *in behalf of* Dungi.

In PSBA. 1915, p. 126 ff., Pinches has published some tablets belonging to Mrs. T. G. Pinches. Tablets iv, v, vi, and vii, of the reign of Bur-Sin, mention periodical offerings (*sa-duga*) connected with Dungi and Bur-Sin, as well as with the god Agara. The association of Dungi and Bur-Sin with a god in the same tablets would seem to indicate that the offerings were made *to* Dungi and Bur-Sin as gods. In the case of Dungi, who is dead, the offering may be a memorial one; and, of course, it is possible that the offering to the living Bur-Sin may be merely *in his behalf*. In tablet iii an offering is made, in the reign of Gimil-Sin, in connection with the throne of Bur-Sin, Dungi, and Ur-Engur. Now Ur-Engur had never been considered a deified king; and in the same tablet an offering is made in connection with the king's son Enim-Nannar who was not considered a deified person, and in fact who was not even a king. The throne referred to in the case of Ur-Engur, Dungi, and Bur-Sin would indicate that the offerings were made either *at* the throne or *for the support of* the throne. However, no preposition is used, and the exact translation is doubtful. There is nothing to forbid one seeing in the same account both an offering *to* the god Agara, and likewise offerings *in behalf of* or *in memory of* a king or king's son. The fact that all these offerings were brought *to the house of the god Agara* would make it reasonable to conclude that the offering in connection with Agara would be *to*

⁷⁰ Statue B, i. 3-11; cf. vii. 45-48.

⁷¹ Cf. RTC. no. 46, obv. ii; RTIh. no. 173, obv. 7.

him, and the offerings in connection with the kings would be *in their behalf* or *in their memory*. Offerings were also made in connection with the statue of Gimil-Sin.⁷²

The earliest extant mention of the institution of a feast and a month named in honor of a king is found in Reisner (RTIh. no. 3, iii. 15), dated in the year 5 + x of Dungi. The feast month is named *itu ezen d-Dungi*.⁷³ This is the seventh month, and was formally called *itu Ur*, a name employed for this month as late as the 24 + x year of Dungi;⁷⁴ or perhaps it was 'otherwise called' *itu Ur*.⁷⁵ In the reign of Gimil-Sin, *ezen d-Dungi* was replaced by *ezen d-Gimil-d-Sin*.⁷⁶ According to the Calendar at Drehem, the same month was called *ezen d-Gimil-d-Sin*.⁷⁷ The naming of a month, however, in honor of a king is in itself no proof of deification.

The sacred grove of Gudea (*giš-šar ša d-Gu-de-a*)⁷⁸ can no more be taken as a proof of the deification of Gudea than can the 'palm tree of Deborah' be taken as a proof of her deification.

The mere mention of a priest of Dungi⁷⁹ is absolutely no indication that he was intended for the cult of Dungi; for, as remarked above, there is no word for cult in the text.

It has been stated that the picture of Gudea as a god has been found on two cylinders published by Scheil.⁸⁰ Gudea is represented as seated with a baton in his hand, and before him stands a priest. But the baton distinguishes a king or prince and not a god. Naram-Sin is represented on a seal cylinder⁸¹ with horns on his head. This has been taken as a representation of his deification. But Naram-Sin stands in an attitude of supplication and is led by a priest into the presence of a seated deity. The

⁷² RT. 19. 185 ff.

⁷³ EAH. 134, rev. 2, AO. 4680; cf. RTC. 417, 418; RA. 7. 186 ff.; RT. 18. 64 ff.; PSBA. 1915, p. 126 ff.

⁷⁴ RTIh. 256.

⁷⁵ ZA. 15. 410; RTIh. 256.

⁷⁶ Kugler, *op. cit.* 2. 145; AO. 4682, 4683.

⁷⁷ Keiser, *Cuneiform Bullae (Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan)*, 3. 18 (1914).

⁷⁸ RTIh. 115, iii. 6.

⁷⁹ SAK. 235, h.

⁸⁰ RT. 18, *Le culte de Gudea*; cf. Scheil, *Notes d'épigraphie*, RT. 21. 26 ff.

⁸¹ Sarzec-Heuzey, *Déc. en Chaldée*, 1 (1893). 287, G.

horns need only be taken to indicate might and authority as is often the case in the Old Testament.⁸²

In addition to the use of the *dingir* or *ilu* in connection with the names of certain kings, or the mention of a temple, statue, offerings, festivals, or priests, there are other expressions which have been taken to show that old Babylonian kings were deified. If it were established beyond doubt that these kings were really deified, the points would serve as accumulative confirmation, but in themselves alone they can not be taken as proof. They are as follows:—

(a) Certain kings call themselves the son of a deity. This is found as early as the time of Lugalzaggisi who calls himself 'a son begotten by Nidaba, nourished with the milk of life by Ninḥarsag, a slave brought up by Ninagidḥadu.'⁸³ But it is very important to note that Lugalzaggisi is not otherwise considered a deity. Other kings are called the children of gods, such as, for example, Naram-Sin,⁸⁴ Sargon I,⁸⁵ Ur-Bau,⁸⁶ and Gudea.⁸⁷ Hammurabi calls himself a son of Sin,⁸⁸ and so does his son Samsuiluna.⁸⁹ As late as Nebuchadrezzar II a similar expression is found.⁹⁰ The practice is of course not to be taken seriously as indicating real divine son-ship, for any ordinary man may be called the child of his god.⁹¹ The king of Moab on the Mesha Stone calls himself son of Chemosh, and the name of Ben-Hadad of Damascus means 'son of Hadad,' which he would most likely consider himself honorifically to be.⁹²

(b) Some of the Babylonian kings referred to themselves as consort of a goddess; thus, Gimil-Sin called Anunit his wife,⁹³

⁸² Compare, especially, Ex. 34. 29.

⁸³ OBI. pl. 87, col. i. 26-34.

⁸⁴ RA. 4. 3, pl. vii, nos. 22, 23.

⁸⁵ OBI. 1. 1, pl. 2.

⁸⁶ Statue I, 7 f.

⁸⁷ Statue B, ii. 16; D, i. 17 f.; Cyl. A, iii. 6.

⁸⁸ Code, 2. 14 ff.

⁸⁹ King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, London, 1898, pl. 191, no. 97, col. ii.

⁹⁰ KB. 3. 2, 11, 23 ff.

⁹¹ Jeremias, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 91.

⁹² See further on Semitic kings: Frazer, *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*,² p. 12-13.

⁹³ SAK. 200, b.

and the kings of Isin spoke of themselves as 'the beloved consort of Innina.'⁹⁴ The title is, of course, honorific.

(c) Other honorific phrases are found at an early date. Eannatum says that he 'was nourished with the milk of life by Ninḫarsag, was endowed with power by Ningirsu, was given intelligence by Enki.'⁹⁵ Similar expressions were used by Entemena⁹⁶ and Lugalzaggesi.⁹⁷ Naram-Sin is called 'lord of the heavenly disk,'⁹⁸ Bur-Sin is called the moon-god's 'young steer,'⁹⁹ and Gimil-Sin is called 'the priest of heaven, the anointed, the bright one of Enlil, of Ninlil, and of the great gods; the king, whom Enlil, for the beloved of his heart, had chosen, for the shepherd of the land, the mighty king, the king of Ur, the king of the four quarters.'¹⁰⁰ All such titles are, of course, merely honorific.

(d) Esarhaddon's declaration that he ascended the divine throne (*kussû ilûti*) instead of the (*kussû šarrûti*) royal throne;¹⁰¹ and the use of the royal name side by side with divine names in oaths¹⁰² do not prove anything in the way of 'emperor'-worship. Neither do such poetical expressions as 'the glorification of the king I made like unto that of a god.'¹⁰³

Frazer in his *Magic Art*, Farnell in his *Greece and Babylon*, and many other writers¹⁰⁴ find 'emperor'-worship among almost all ancient peoples, except among the Assyrians.¹⁰⁵ They all claim it for ancient Babylonia. Such an array of opinion ought

⁹⁴ SAK. 206.

⁹⁵ SAK. 20, b.

⁹⁶ SAK. 34, k.

⁹⁷ BE. 1, 2. 52.

⁹⁸ RT. 19. 187.

⁹⁹ PSBA. 1915, p. 88 f.

¹⁰⁰ Clay, *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Bab. Collection*, New Haven, 1915, p. 16.

¹⁰¹ Winckler, *Ex Oriente Lux*, 2. 109.

¹⁰² Mercer, *The Oath in the Sumerian Inscriptions*, JAOS. 33. 33-50; Mercer, *The Oath in the Babylonian Inscriptions of the time of the Hammurabi Dynasty*, AJSL. 29.

¹⁰³ Jastrow, *The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, Philadelphia, 1915, p. 478.

¹⁰⁴ For example, Barnett, *Antiquities of India*; Sykes, *History of Persia*; Róheim, in *Man*, 1915, no. 13; Grimme, *Mohammed*; Iverach, 'Caesarism,' in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

¹⁰⁵ See esp. Kugler, *Sternkunde u. Sterndienst*, 2. 1. 144 ff.

to have some weight.¹⁰⁶ But an impartial examination of this material shows that so far, at least, we are unable to acquiesce in their opinion.

Let us now review and summarize what the Babylonian sources have taught us. While savages appear to put no limit to the possible power of man, reverencing him, and honoring him, the reverence and honor are due to fear of the mysterious and do not in themselves reach the height of what we call worship, though they may go far towards preparing the way for it. The most that we can certainly say of 'emperor'-worship of Babylonian kings during their lifetime is that they were honored by being called *dīngir* or *īlu*, which may mean nothing more than 'lord' or 'king'; and they were honorifically recognized by memorials and other signs of regard, even as Nebuchadrezzar honored Daniel by bowing to him and presenting him with offerings usually offered only to a god. It would be easier to believe in the worship of ancient Babylonian kings *after* their death, since the worship of the dead seems to have been rather common among Semitic peoples,¹⁰⁷ and is quite a natural procedure. Josephus says in his *Antiquities*, 9. 4. 6, that Ben-Hadad and Hazael were known in his time as gods by reason of their benefactions. Already in the lifetime of Dungi a town was called *d.Dun-gi.d.Babbar^{ki}*,¹⁰⁸ and it would be natural to conclude that such a compliment would be increased after his lifetime, and that a quasi-divine power would be ascribed to such a king, and that even prayers might be addressed to him.¹⁰⁹ But such would not necessarily be deification. There is, however, an interesting text which contains an explanatory list of gods drawn up for Ašur-bani-pal's library at Nineveh.¹¹⁰ The name *Bur-Sin* is given as that of an attendant deity in the service of the moon-god. If this name be the same as that of the ancient

¹⁰⁶ See, however, Toy in his *Introduction to the History of Religion*, p. 140-147 where he says that Frazer's collection in this respect is not reliable (*Golden Bough*,² 1. 139 ff.). Toy is also of the opinion that 'as far as the known evidence goes, the king (of Babylonia) seems never to have been approached with divine worship' (p. 143).

¹⁰⁷ Compare Eze. 43. 7-9. and Wisdom 14. 16-20.

¹⁰⁸ SAK. 196, *d*.

¹⁰⁹ Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, Boston, 1898, p. 605.

¹¹⁰ CT. 25. pl. 7 (cf. King, *op. cit.* p. 299).

Babylonian king (1650 years before), we would apparently have a real deification. But the god and the king, although having the same name, may not be identical, for the text is too brief to allow of certainty. However, the name of the ancient king, with time, may have become famous and hence may have been attached to a minor deity in the time of Ašur-bani-pal as a convenient name. Or there may have been a conscious attempt to honor the ancient king by paying him divine respect, and making him a god. But this would be 'emperor'-worship in Assyria and not in Babylonia; and would, moreover, be merely an isolated example in Assyria. (Ašur-bani-pal himself was considered a god in Asia Minor and Cilicia long after his death. Streck, *op. cit.* p. 763.)

The tablet at Mosul discussed by Scheil in ZA. 12. 265-266, which contains the name ^dBur-^dSin-mul-amar-ud, does not prove an astral cult for Bur-Sin, for the name, like ^dDungi-Uru, is a compound of the royal name and a divine name, and merely identifies Bur-Sin with the planet or constellation of Marduk (*mul-Marduk*) in an honorific way.¹¹¹ Besides Bur-Sin, there is not one instance of a Babylonian king who can be considered as having been certainly deified *even after his death*. And the deification of Bur-Sin itself may have been merely formal, for there is no evidence that a regular cult with followers existed. What recognition was accorded to early Babylonian kings after their death can be considered either honorific or political, even as the imperial cult in Rome was mostly political.¹¹²

Moreover, Babylonians were always conscious of the humanity of their rulers, and though the distance between a god and a man was not great, yet they never seem to have mistaken one for the other. Such kings as Gimil-Sin were always referred to as 'king' (*lugal*), and such phrases as 'the mighty man' were used consistently of those very kings who took the title *dingir*.¹¹³ These kings were often called 'priests',¹¹⁴ and, as Fowler¹¹⁵ remarks about Augustus, the office of a king as priest

¹¹¹ See, however, Hommel, *Grundriss*, p. 115, n. 3, and p. 121.

¹¹² Beurlier, *Le cult rendu aux empereurs romains*, Paris, 1891; cf. Kugler, *op. cit.* p. 144-149.

¹¹³ E.g. SAK. 190, b, d, h.

¹¹⁴ E.g. Gimil-Sin, Clay, *op. cit.* p. 16.

¹¹⁵ *Roman Ideas of Deity*, p. 124.

or chief priest 'is a position absolutely incompatible with god-head.' Nor did Babylonian deification, if it ever existed, affect in any way the cultus. There does not seem to have been any place in the regular cultus for the worship of such deities, nor can there be found any expressions of worship and adoration such as are found in Egyptian texts.

Early Semitic thought represented gods, men, animals, and even plants as forming a single society;¹¹⁶ they claimed human descent from the gods; their rulers and kings believed that their wisdom and power came from the gods, and even represented themselves as sons of deities; in fact any Babylonian child may be called the *zêr-ilî* or 'seed of god';¹¹⁷ and so it was not strange that the custom arose of giving the ruler or king the title *dingir* or *ilu*. Yet it can be shown that the Babylonian rulers and kings always thought that they were quite distinct from the gods, especially during their lifetime, and most likely also after their death, though the Babylonians did conceive of the possibility of a favored being becoming immortal after death,¹¹⁸ but this was not considered the lot of all mankind nor even of kings. And thus, although the gods and men were closely related, yet they were never confused even in the days of those ancient kings of Akkad and Ur who used the title *dingir* or *ilu* or to whose name these titles were added after their death. The temples, statues, offerings, festivals, groves, priests, and pictures, referred to in connection with various kings of early Babylonia, do not prove the deification of these kings, but merely show the esteem in which they or their memories were held. The use of the divine determinative in the case of royal names may be explained, in many cases, as due to the presence of a divine element in the royal name, and in all other cases as an honorific title. Likewise the use of such names as *d.Dungi-ba-ni*, 'Dungi is my creator,' or *d.Dungi-d.Babbar*, 'Dungi is the sun-god,' after the death of the king, can also be easily explained as honorific names. The only possible exception to all this is the case of Bur-Sin who may have been considered

¹¹⁶ Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, *passim*.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Gen. 4. 1. It is interesting to note in this connection that the ideogram for AMA, which means primarily 'house of deity,' has a figurative meaning 'womb' (*rimu*), and hence means 'mother' (*ummu*).

¹¹⁸ E.g. Ut-napištim and his wife.

a god in the time of Ašur-bani-pal, but an absolutely final decision cannot be rendered even in this instance. In any case, it would not apply to Babylonian 'emperor'-worship.

Those scholars who find a real deification of the kings in ancient Babylonia have tried to determine the source of the usage, but no unanimity of opinion has been attained. Meyer,¹¹⁹ Barton,¹²⁰ and King¹²¹ favor a Sumerian origin, and Toy¹²² follows them in holding that the custom is not a native Semitic one, but found among some Asiatic non-Semitic peoples, and was probably adopted by the Semitic Babylonians from the non-Semitic Asiatic Sumerians. He holds that the custom ceased with the first great Semitic dynasty of Babylon. Thureau-Dangin claims Egypt as its source,¹²³ because of the contact between Egypt and Sargon I in Palestine and Syria. But Lugalzaggisi in still earlier days, and Ašurbanipal and Nebuchadrezzar II in later times, also came into close contact with Egypt. Radau¹²⁴ is the champion of a Semitic origin, specially Arabia, and explains the supposed presence of the custom among the Sumerians, such as Dungi, etc., as due to close contact with the Semitic Babylonians. There is no proof that the Sumerian strain of the dynasty of Ur was any weaker than the Semitic.

The explanations of the origin of such a custom have been various. It has been contended that this claim to deification made by Babylonian kings was due to their allegiance to the mighty god of Nippur, but the fact that Ur-Engur seems to have been as closely related to Nippur as his successors of the dynasty of Ur, would disprove this contention. The title 'king of the four quarters of the world' has been considered the source of the custom, but the earliest inscriptions of Sargon I have the divine determinative, yet contain no mention of the title 'king of the four quarters of the world.'¹²⁵

If 'emperor'-worship in Babylonia be proved when more literature is at hand, it will not be necessary to go outside of

¹¹⁹ *Geschichte des Altertums*, i, § 402, Berlin, 1902-1909.

¹²⁰ Barton, *Semitic Origins*, pp. 168 ff., New York, 1902.

¹²¹ King, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹²² Toy, *op. cit.*, § 342.

¹²³ RT. 19, etc.

¹²⁴ EBH. pp. 307 ff.

¹²⁵ SAK. 162 ff.; Cf. King, *Chronicles of Early Babylonian Kings*, 2. 27 ff.

Babylonia itself either among the Sumerians or among the Semitic-Babylonians to look for such an idea. For the development of 'emperor'-worship out of the early Babylonian doctrine of the close relation between gods and men would be a logical one. It must, however, be said that such a development cannot as yet, in our present state of knowledge, be certainly proved to have actually taken place.